IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.5902 of 2006

Dated: June 26, 2006

Between:

Mrs. M. Padmasri, W/o. Sri M.V.R. Murthy,
aged 43 years, Junior Lecturer in French,
St. Mary's Centenary Junior College, Plot No.18,
East Anandbagh, Opp: Gajaram Function Hall,
Safilguda, Hyderabad, and another.

… Petitioners

And

Hyderabad Archdiocese Educational Society,
rep. by its Arch Bishop and Chairman,
Archbishop's House, Sardar Patel Road,
Secunderabad – 500 003, and five others.

… Respondents

Order:

The petitioners, lecturers in the first respondent, an educational society, are questioning the proceedings of the first respondent dated 06-02-2006, by which it was decided to terminate their services.

2. By the aforesaid order, the petitioners were informed that their

services are not needed from the academic year 2006-07 stating certain reasons, namely, the strength of the college coming down, expenditure towards salaries increasing year by year and the work load being very less. Principally, the aforesaid order is questioned on the ground that there is no prior approval of the competent authority as required under Section 83 of the A.P. Education Act, 1982 ('the Act' for brevity) before terminating their services.

3. The first respondent has filed counter, enclosing proceedings of the Vice-Chairman of the first respondent, in which it is categorically stated that the management, on the representations received from various staff, has reconsidered the matter and it was resolved to streamline the salary structure instead of terminating the service of the petitioners.

4. As much as the impugned order has been questioned on the proposed termination, no further orders need be passed in the writ petition and the same is accordingly closed, placing on record the averments made by the respondents in the counter affidavit, wherein it was resolved not to terminate the services of the petitioners. However, if the petitioners are aggrieved by any action of the respondents in streamlining their salaries, it is open for them to question the same. No order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

June 26, 2006
MRR